UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,405	01/31/2002	Yuki Aoyama	16869N-041900US	3749

			EXAMINER
20350	7590	12/22/2004	BLACKWELL, JAMES H

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
10/066,405</td><td>Applicant(s)
AOYAMA ET AL.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
James H Blackwell</td><td>Art Unit
2176</td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 January 2002</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-7 and 9-11</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>4 and 8</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>31 January 2002</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/31/02</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 5-6, and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Johnson et al. (hereinafter Johnson, U.S. Patent No. 5,813,009).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 5, 9, and

11), Johnson teaches a computer based records management system (*a document

management means*) comprising an information filter for assuring that record data units

offered to the system for storage (*an accumulation means*) are complete and not

redundant. Record data units accepted for the system entry are acknowledged and

preferably tagged to enable tracking and forwarded for unit verification and certification.

Once a unit is found to be compliant with preset criteria, the unit is stored in permanent

storage (*document is accumulated*) along with a disposal schedule determined for that

unit (see Abstract). Johnson also teaches that version management is used to

control/reduce multiple iterations of electronic data which may be resident within an

organization, across applicable hardware and software platforms and physical and

geographical locations (*a version control means that manages version control

information for the accumulation that assigns a version to a prepared transaction

document*) (Col. 6, lines 15-19). Johnson also teaches that outbound information or

record data units may consist of processed data files, such as EDI data streams

produced by business applications 5 (*an EDI means that creates and sends EDI data for*

an electronic transaction) (Col. 13, lines 41-43). It may also consist of information

produced at a specific user workstation 7 (e.g., text files, images faxed, etc.), which is

considered by the organization or user to be important to the business of the enterprise

and therefore, important to be tracked (Col. 13, lines 43-47). Johnson also teaches an

information filtering process (*a linkage means that links the document management*

means and the EDI means), which occurs prior to verification/certification. During

information filtering, incomplete or redundant units are identified and such units, for

example, may be acknowledged or forwarded for special handling or the like.

Information filtering may serve to route input record data units to designated

destinations. Preferably, data units passed on for verification/certification are tagged to

enable tracking of units through the system, for example, for subsequent auditing (Col.

5, lines 9-18). Johnson also teaches that the filter determines which coded information

is maintained for validation, processing, retention, retrieval, information collection and

dissemination and ultimate disposal for a single or multiple organization units (*registers*

sending information of the EDI data in the version control information of the relevant

transaction document) (Col. 10, lines 26-30). Johnson also teaches that the filter

attaches to incoming records a tag (i.e., envelope, pointer or reference entry prior to,

application processing) which can be associated with a database in order to track the

source, destination, version, storage location(s) and retention data associated with the

record. Where information does not enter the filter, e.g., scanned input, appropriate tag

(or tracking) information is added during the verification/certification process. For internally created information, created either at the individual workstation or by business applications, information considered to be important for saving may be sent to the filter for tagging, prior to being released either internally for further handling, or externally to trading partners, etc. Where no further handling other than verification/certification is required, such information may be routed directly to the verification/certification module for operator handling. In either case, incomplete information is trapped and sent to hold area 4 and held for input of the necessary processing information by the Records Manager or other designated individual (*when the accumulated transaction document and the version are selected and attached to the EDI data, then the EDI data is sent*) (Col. 10, lines 30-49).

In regard to dependent Claim 2 (and similarly dependent Claims 6, and 10), Johnson teaches that outbound information or record data units may consist of processed data files, such as EDI data streams produced by business applications (5) (Col. 13, lines 41-43; compare with Claim 2 (and similarly Claims 6, and 10), *"... the EDI means comprises a means for receiving EDI data"*). Johnson also teaches that the filter determines which coded information is maintained for validation, processing, retention, retrieval, information collection and dissemination and ultimate disposal for a single or multiple organization units (Col. 10, lines 26-30). Johnson also teaches that the filter attaches to incoming records a tag (i.e., envelope, pointer or reference entry prior to application processing) which can be associated with a database in order to track the source, destination, version, storage location(s) and retention data associated

with the record. Where information does not enter the filter, e.g., scanned input,

appropriate tag (or tracking) information is added during the verification/certification

process. For internally created information, created either at the individual workstation

or by business applications, information considered to be important for saving may be

sent to the filter for tagging, prior to being released either internally for further handling,

or externally to trading partners, etc. Where no further handling other than

verification/certification is required, such information may be routed directly to the

verification/certification module for operator handling. In either case, incomplete

information is trapped and sent to hold area 4 and held for input of the necessary

processing information by the Records Manager or other designated individual (*when

the accumulated transaction document and the version are selected and attached to the

EDI data, then the EDI data is sent*) (Col. 10, lines 30-49). Johnson also teaches that

the Filter (3) also checks incoming information for redundancy with currently archived

records (e.g., whether a record with the same index criteria and date/time stamp data

has already been archived) and determines whether potentially redundant information is

identified as replacement data intended to overlay the existing file. Redundancy (and

potential for information resent from the source) is detected by accessing the central

ILM database 13 and system audit file 9. Where redundancy is detected, the record

(e.g., file) is deleted from the processing stream and sent to hold area 4. The deletion

and the potential redundancy are then reported to the Records Manager or other central

facility for resolution and for audit purposes (Col. 9, lines 66-67; Col. 10, lines 1-11). So

if the version is a duplicate of something already in the system, it is ultimately removed,

otherwise it is received and given a version number, timestamp, etc. Compare with

Claim 2 (and similarly Claims 6, and 10), *"... the linkage means, when a transaction*

document is attached to the received EDI data and the transaction document that

corresponds to the attached document is already managed by the document

management means accumulates the attached document as the latest version of

the relevant transaction document"). Johnson also teaches that filter (3) further

verifies whether information has previously been processed by the enterprise

applications or is still to be processed or received by the destination address (*first*

version of a new document). Where the information has yet to be processed or

received, the filter first verifies the information integrity and then returns any necessary

acknowledgments to the source, logs the receipt of the information and routes the

information to the proper destination, e.g., business applications 5 or user workstation 7.

The filter also reviews the priority assigned to the incoming records (from an internally

maintained table or by reading a priority indicator received with the incoming data) to

ensure timely processing of priority information. Priority records, which require

processing, are forwarded with the appropriate priority processing indicator or flag (Col.

10, lines 12-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Johnson.

In regard to dependent Claim 3 (and similarly dependent Claim 7), <u>Johnson</u>

teaches that operator intervention is required where error conditions are detected during

the filter, audit, special handling, data buffering, ILM capture or database update

operations which require manual intervention. Errors occurring outside system

boundaries (e.g., within business applications, user workstations or backup processes)

should be monitored and corrected within those processes, but may be detected by the

ILM capture module (Col. 14, lines 58-65; compare with Claim 3 (and similarly Claim 7),

"... the linkage means deletes the sending information of the EDI data from the

version control information when a sending error occurs, or sending is disabled

in the EDI data sent by the EDI means"). <u>Johnson</u> does not specifically teach that the

filter (*linkage means*) deletes information found to be in error (*document received*

incomplete, scrambled or otherwise in error), but instead passes it along for further

scrutiny. It is at this point that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of invention that <u>Johnson</u> would have been able to determine a course of

action based on any error that occurred, whether the document be deleted, resent,

repaired, etc. The point is, that the information would only be allowed into the system if

it were correct and complete. The benefit would have been to eliminate corrupted data

from entering the system.

Claim Objections

Claims 4, and 8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because multiple dependent claims 4, and 8 cannot depend on another multiple dependent claims 3, and 7. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, claims 4, and 8 have not been further treated on the merits.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6,148,312	715/530	11/14/2000
6,289,460	713/200	09/11/2001
6,360,252	709/206	03/19/2002

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

James H. Blackwell
12/08/04